Picatinny Arsenal Environmental Restoration Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes, Thursday, February 6, 2014
Hilton Garden Inn – Rockaway, New Jersey

Attendees

Name	Organization
Members	
Ted Gabel	Government Co-Chair, Picatinny Arsenal
Mark Hiler	Community Co-Chair, Rockaway Twp. Env. Commisssion
Tom Brackin	Community Member, Rockaway Township
Chris Dour	Official representative of Denville Township
Pat Matarazzo	Community Member, Township of Verona; NJ Clean Water Council
Virginia Michelin	Official representative, Morris County, Planning & Development
Anne Pavelka	NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP)
William Roach	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Cara Sileno	Official representative of Rockaway Township
Tom Trapasso	Official representative, Borough of Rockaway
Members of the Public, Support Staff for RAB, Picatinny, EPA and NJDEP	
Tom Solecki	Picatinny Environmental Management Division
Frank Misurelli	Picatinny Public Affairs Office
Jon VandeVentor	Picatinny Natural Resource Manager
Tom Crone	ARCADIS
Tim Llewellyn	ARCADIS
Lisa Szegedi	ARCADIS
Mary Ellen Maly	US Army Environmental Command
J.B. Smith	Picatinny Safety Office
Bruce Adami	Denville Resident
Joseph Marchesani	NJ Department of Environmental Protection
Neil Julian	Picatinny/ARDEC
Brian Steigerwalt	Weston Solutions
Nicole Sharkey	Weston Solutions
Barbara Dolce	Subsurface Solutions
Katrina Harris	Bridge Consulting Corp.

Mr. Ted Gabel convened the meeting at 6:31 p.m. He welcomed all to the meeting and thanked everyone for attending.

Attendance

Ms. Harris took attendance of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) members. Mr. Gabel invited all others present to introduce themselves.

Correspondence

Mr. Gabel confirmed with Ms. Harris that no new correspondence had been received since the last meeting, and Ms. Harris agreed.

Resolutions, Motions, Significant Events

- A motion was made by Mr. Chris Dour, seconded by Mr. Pat Matarazzo, and unanimously passed to approve the October 24, 2013 meeting minutes.

- The next meeting timeframe was set for April 2014.

Old Business

Mr. Gabel asked Mr. William Roach if he could provide an update on the action item he had to discuss with US EPA management if EPA could provide funding for a technical assistance grant. Mr. Roach responded that he had discussed the topic with his supervisor who advised funding is scarce, and he did not think it would be possible to provide technical assistance funding.

Agenda

Slide 1 (of Mr. Gabel's presentation): **Agenda for February 6th Picatinny Arsenal RAB**

Mr. Gabel reviewed the meeting agenda.

Slide 2: Technical Assistance for Public Participation Contract

Mr. Gabel gave an update on the status of the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) contract with Subsurface Solutions. He stated the second option year started recently and approximately $4,000 has been spent to date. Mr. Gabel reminded the Board the second option year is the final year of the contract and the final year of the second waiver that had been granted by the Army for the community members of the Board to have a technical assistance grant.

Mr. Gabel reviewed a list of some reports that will be submitted soon and could possibly be reviewed by the TAPP consultant. He asked the Board if they would like to vote on them that evening or continue to receive Doodle polls. Ms. Virginia Michelin said she prefers to see the executive summaries if they exist for a document before making a decision as in most cases she feels the executive summary is sufficient. Mr. Gabel said he will continue to provide executive summaries where they exist as part of a document and have Ms. Harris continue to poll the Board through Doodle.

Slides 3 - 7: Resolution of the Five Site Dispute

Mr. Gabel stated copies of letters from the Army and EPA had been provided by email to the Board. He explained the question at the center of the dispute is when do Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) come into play and what are those ARARs when a risk assessment shows an unacceptable risk. He advised the Army and EPA initially had different positions, but the Army is now agreeing with EPA on these sites only where there is unacceptable risk from exposure to soils. He added there will be a caveat in the documents that the position will not be precedent setting. Mr. Gabel said the Army's position was that only the contaminants of concern were the drivers and therefore would be the ARARs. He noted the Army now agrees for these sites since there is unacceptable soil risk for a current or future land use the NJDEP soil cleanup standard must be attained by the remedial action, regardless of whether the contaminant has been designated as a risk driver. Mr. Gabel said EPA during the November Dispute Resolution also has agreed that the two sites with manganese in the soil will not need remedial action. He explained the Army will submit a revised Feasibility Study and prepare a Proposed Plan for the three sites, while the two sites where action will not be proposed will be added to the 45 Site Feasibility Study and Proposed Plan. Mr. Gabel advised that unfortunately the actual remediation will most likely be addressed in the next contract.

Mr. Gabel showed photos of the three sites where hot spots are located, based on ARARs, and where remedial action will be done. He said the remedial action is planned for 2017. Ms. Dolce asked why the remedial action would not be done until 2017. Mr. Gabel responded the current contract with ARCADIS will expire in December 2014. He continued explaining that by the time a new contract is put in place, a Record of Decision is written and signed, and a Remedial Design prepared, it will most likely be 2017 before remedial action is implemented.

Military Munitions Response Program/Remedial Investigation Report Update:

Slide 1 (of Mr. Steigerwalt's presentation): Mr. Gabel introduced Mr. Ryan Steigerwalt of Weston Solutions to give an update on the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) Remedial Investigation Report. Mr. Steigerwalt advised a draft Remedial Investigation Report had been submitted in December, and he would be reviewing some of the key information from the report.

Slide 2: Mr. Steigerwalt advised there were nine MMRP sites encompassing about 5100 acres across the installation as well as several off-post sites.

Slide 3: Mr. Steigerwalt displayed a map showing the nine site locations.

Slide 4: Mr. Steigerwalt explained a comprehensive investigation was conducted including extensive geophysical surveys, land-based and underwater investigations, and hand-held magnetometer sweeps. He noted the investigation was planned using a statistical approach as he had explained at a previous meeting. He stated geophysical surveys were performed followed by intrusive operations at places where metal was located underground to see if the metal detections were munition related. Mr. Steigerwalt said environmental sampling also was performed to determine if munition constituents were present.

Slide 5: Mr. Steigerwalt displayed a chart summarizing the investigations. He stated he would explain the results of the investigation at each site.

Slides 6 and 7: Mr. Steigerwalt first discussed the Shell Burial Grounds, noting it was the center of the 1926 explosion. He explained there are two separate areas, one on the west side consisting of two craters that formed during the 1926 explosion and one on the east side where there is another crater. He stated part of the investigation was determining the extent of the craters and munitions. He said a number of geophysics, transect surveys and modeling was performed, including modeling to determine the volume of debris. He advised the volume of pit 1 is 33,000 cubic yards of material, while pit 2 is 28,000 cubic yards of material, and the crater has about 80,000 cubic yards of material. He noted the investigation confirmed the boundaries of the pits and craters and helped to better assess the various layers of material. Mr. Steigerwalt displayed profile information of the site features, noting the various layers and depths.

Mr. Mark Hiler asked if the craters were filled in with dirt or debris and their depth. Mr. Steigerwalt responded the craters were partially filled in and then used by the Navy for several years before being completely covered. He stated one crater on the east side is about 40 feet deep, while the others are smaller (15 to 30 feet deep and not as wide). Mr. Hiler asked if any unexploded ordnance was present and if it was a concern. Mr. Steigerwalt responded the likelihood of finding unexploded ordnance is low. He said when the explosion occurred, discarded military munitions were in the magazines and that is what was pushed into the craters and likely still present but buried. Mr. Steigerwalt said no munitions were seen on the ground surface during the investigations. In response to a question about whether land-use controls are in place, Mr. J.B. Smith responded such controls are in place including signage, fencing, the fill in the craters, and military law enforcement patrols. In response to a question about the potential for frost heave moving munitions to the surface, Mr. Smith said frost heave occurs within four feet of the surface and the munitions are about seven feet deep. Mr. Steigerwalt added that frost heave was evaluated during the investigation.

Slide 8: Mr. Steigerwalt next discussed the on-post and off-post 1926 Explosion Radius. He pointed out the areas investigated and noted the investigation was able to help interpret munition densities. He advised munitions and explosives of concern were determined to be present as was expected, and the investigation helped to interpret munition densities. Mr. Steigerwalt noted an additional site, called the fuze area, was discovered where there is a preponderance of fuzes, and was delineated as part of the investigation,

Slide 9: Mr. Steigerwalt reviewed the Green Pond Brook/Former DRMO Yard site, noting it originated separate from the 1926 explosion. He advised the investigation found the site had a similar conceptual site model to the 1926 explosion ranges, so it was recommended the site be merged into the 1926 Explosion Radius Site. Mr. Steigerwalt stated geophysical surveys were conducted along the banks and in the water at Green Pond Brook, as well as investigating the Former DRMO Yard where munition debris and one munition item were found.

Slides 10 - 12: Mr. Steigerwalt discussed the Former Operational Areas and pointed out the dots on an aerial photograph where intrusive investigations were performed and the green dots

denoting cultural debris or scrap. He advised the field work also found some munition debris, but the majority of the munitions and explosives of concern recovered were near the southern boundary, a former mortar range. Mr. Steigerwalt added the investigation was able to detect and delineate the formerly unknown mortar range so the approach was successful. Mr. Steigerwalt showed an aerial photograph of where munition constituent sampling was performed at the Former Operational Areas. He advised a few areas were found where additional work is needed mainly because of manganese, but the risk assessment did not find any risk associated with these areas.

Slides 13 - 16: Mr. Steigerwalt next discussed the Lake Picatinny and Lake Denmark munition response site. He stated work was conducted along the shoreline of Lake Picatinny and underwater geophysical work was done in the open water. He advised one munition item was found and some munition debris. He stated the firing point was investigated but no munition items were found, just some munition debris. Mr. Steigerwalt said cultural debris was found along the shoreline. Mr. Steigerwalt noted underwater and land investigations were done at Lake Denmark. He stated a few mortars and some munition debris were recovered, but no impact areas associated with the former mortar range were found. Mr. Steigerwalt said the investigation of the off-post portion of the Lake Denmark site included first assessing all previous studies. He said sampling was then performed, as well as visual surveys. He noted much scrap and cultural debris were found. He advised there had been no prior reports of munitions and none were found.

Slides 17 and 18: Mr. Steigerwalt reviewed the investigation at the Inactive Munitions Waste Pit Site which has both a on-post and off-post component. He stated the disposal area had been covered with fill at various points. He explained that using EM-31 surveys, buried metal areas were able to be delineated and confirmed to be consistent with Installation Restoration Program intrusive investigations. He stated the magnetometer and instructive work off-post found some munition debris, fragments, and cultural debris.

Slides 19 and 20: Mr. Steigerwalt explained all the information gathered during the investigations was put into data bases and used to conduct munition hazard, risk and probability assessments. Mr. Steigerwalt displayed a chart showing the conclusions of the investigation and assessments. He summarized the results by stating two new sites were added, the Green Pond Site was merged with the 1926 Explosion Radius Site, Lake Denmark Off-Post and Inactive Munitions Waste Off-Post were found to pose no risk, and all other sites had explosive hazards that need to be addressed in a feasibility study.

Mr. Gabel advised that at a meeting earlier that day EPA and New Jersey Department of the Environment had agreed the remedial investigation was complete for all sites, and the Army could proceed to a feasibility study. Mr. Gabel said a few comments on the remedial investigation will be addressed and then finalized within the next few months. He stated the Feasibility Study will then be put under contract.

Installation Restoration Program/Groundwater Updates and Former Burning Grounds Update:

Slide 1 (of Mr. Crone's presentation): Mr. Gabel introduced Mr. Thomas Crone of ARCADIS to give an update on several groundwater remediations and on the Former Burning Grounds.

Slide 2: Mr. Crone showed a list of the projects under ARCADIS' contract and where each project is currently in relation to the Comprehensive Environmental Restoration, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) process. He explained green indicated phases completed and orange indicated the task was in progress.

Ms. Virginia Michelin commented that the chart was a great overview and requested it be kept updated. She said it would particularly be a good resource for new members, as well as current members, to show what has been done and where the program is currently. Mr. Gabel responded that he would add the sites outside of ARCADIS' contract and send the chart out to the Board.

Slide 3: Mr. Crone said he would first discuss the Mid Valley Groundwater project. He showed a photo of the injection being done the previous March and noted the same work was done for the injection this past December. He reminded the Board emulsified vegetable oil is mixed with water as shown in the photograph and injected into the groundwater through injection wells.

Slide 4: Mr. Crone showed the key steps in the CERCLA process and noted the Mid Valley Groundwater is at the last step, the long-term operation, monitoring and maintenance phase.

Slide 5: Mr. Crone displayed a map showing the site's location in the center of Picatinny. He stated the remedy for the Mid Valley groundwater is in-situ bioremediation which involves injecting emulsified vegetable oil into 18 wells and then flushing with clean water to get it into the bedrock formation to treat trichloroethylene (TCE). He reminded the Board the site also has a monitored natural attenuation remedy for RDX (an explosive compound), and he would be sharing the first round of data available for that remedy. Mr. Crone stated part of this remedy includes groundwater monitoring downgradient of the Shell Burial Area so any potential impacts from the debris at that site is being monitored.

Slide 6: Mr. Crone reviewed a graphic showing the regional conceptual site model. He explained the site is on the side of the Valley with groundwater flowing down towards Green Pond Brook.

Slide 7: Mr. Crone displayed a map showing the areas of contaminated groundwater. He pointed out a large but fairly diffuse area of TCE-contaminated groundwater, with the treatment area having the higher concentrations of TCE. He pointed out a northern area with TCE contamination that is under the monitored natural attenuation remedy, and a deeper area of RDX-contaminated groundwater which is also under the monitored natural attenuation remedy.

Slide 8: Mr. Crone reviewed the 2013 in-situ bioremediation activities. He stated February through March was the baseline performance monitoring, with the first injection of emulsified vegetable oil occurring in March followed by a second injection in December. He noted favorable results already have been seen in several wells.

Slides 9 - 11: Mr. Crone said he would first discuss the in-situ remedy. He showed a map with the locations of the TCE in the deeper groundwater and where treatment is focused. He noted there are three injection lines where the emulsified vegetable oil is injected into the groundwater. He said the emulsified vegetable oil helps to break down the TCE into DCE and then into dissolved organic carbon. Mr. Crone said they are looking for an increase in the dissolved organic carbon or a decrease in the TCE or an increase in the TCE breakdown products.

Slides 12 - 19: Mr. Crone then showed a series of graphs depicting the results of the monitoring of the groundwater after the injections. He discussed the increases in dissolved organic carbon and decreases in TCE. He summarized by saying the second injection introduced more carbon into the subsurface. He reiterated that the early results look favorable, but quarterly sampling will continue.

Slide 20: Mr. Crone next discussed the Shell Burial Area.

Slides 21 and 22: Mr. Crone displayed a map showing the location of the Shell Burial Area. He showed a second map showing the craters discussed earlier by Mr. Steigerwalt. He pointed out the groundwater flow direction and the upgradient and downgradient wells. He stated groundwater is moving towards the EOD Pond. He noted the wells are monitored on a quarterly basis with four quarters of data collected in 2013 and another four quarters of data being collected in 2014. Mr. Crone said the sampling results are analyzed for any differences from past results indicating some type of release from the buried debris, but they have not seen anything in the data collected in 2013.

Slides 23 - 25: Mr. Crone next discussed the larger, diffuse groundwater plumes in the Mid Valley Area. Mr. Crone showed the RDX plume, the northern volatile organic compound plume, and the western volatile organic compound plume on a map. He advised four quarters of data exist for the RDX plume which indicate the levels of RDX are stable to declining. He said the northern plume also is stable or declining. Mr. Crone stated the western plume showed a slight increase in TCE concentrations (from 2 parts per billion to 4 parts per billion).

Slide 26: Mr. Crone concluded by saying the data is just one year of a 35-year remedy so the long-term monitoring and monitored natural attenuation remedy will proceed as designed.

Mr. Hiler asked if there would be more injections. Mr. Crone said none are anticipated for this year, but injections will occur every one to two years over the next 23 years but data will continue to be analyzed and adjustments made accordingly.

Slide 27: Mr. Crone next discussed the Area B groundwater remediation.

Slide 28: Mr. Crone stated the remedy for the Area B groundwater involved the injection of molasses into eight different wells. He stated the injections and monitoring have occurred over the past five years. He said from 2015 and beyond operation, monitoring and annual certification will continue.

Slide 29: Mr. Crone briefly reviewed the site history, noting the contaminant of concern is TCE. He advised that the Record of Decision stipulated that the site cleanup levels be attained within seven years which is the end of next year. He stated the last injection was done in 2011. He explained at this site a key indicator is the level of carbon which has stayed elevated at this site. Mr. Crone advised site cleanup levels have been attained at seven of the nine wells, with the final two wells having detections of vinyl chloride which is the final product seen in the breakdown of TCE. Mr. Crone stated the conclusion is the remedy is functioning as anticipated, and the goals should be achieved within seven years.

Slides 30 - 32: Mr. Crone displayed a chart showing the concentrations of the contaminants of concern. He stated PCE was not seen at the site, the TCE is now at non-detect levels, cDCE with a cleanup level of 70 parts per billion is being detected at much lower levels, 1,1-DCE with a cleanup level of 1 part per billion is at non-detect, and two wells have level of vinyl chloride above the cleanup standard. Mr. Crone mentioned there had been a high concentration of vinyl chloride detected the previous year which seemed anomalous; the well was re-sampled and current detection level is 35 parts per billion. He stated the well will be sampled again in 2014.

Slides 33 - 35: Mr. Crone next discussed the Former Lower Burning Ground. He advised the Remedial Design and Explanation of Significant Difference had been submitted to the regulators. He advised the Army had responded to the regulators comments, with EPA accepting the responses and the State close to giving their approval. Mr. Crone said ARCADIS will be implementing the asphalt cap and soil cover over the summer with an anticipated completion date of the end of July.

Mr. Gabel noted ARCADIS is coordinating with the company who will be installing solar panels after the remedy is in place. Mr. Gabel advised the coordination includes the permit equivalencies required under CERCLA so no additional permits will be needed for the solar panels.

Mr. Crone showed the project schedule. The Board agreed a tour of the site should be planned for October.

Area C Groundwater Update

Slide 1: Mr. Gabel introduced Ms. Lisa Szegedi to give an update on the Area C Groundwater Monitoring. Ms. Szegedi stated Area C is along the southern boundary of the installation. She noted the long-term monitoring plan which was developed as part of the Record of Decision required monitoring of 16 wells, two upgradient wells and 14 wells within Area C, in addition to 16 wells along the boundary to make sure nothing is migrating off-post. She said the long-term monitoring program thus started with 32 wells. Ms. Szegedi said the Record of Decision was signed in 2009 and the long-term monitoring began in 2010. She explained the first statistical evaluation was not conducted until four rounds of sampling data had been collected, with three statistical evaluations completed to date and a draft of the fourth evaluation has just been submitted to the Army.

Slides 2 - 4: Ms. Szegedi stated that what has historically been found at the site has been volatile organic compounds, metals and sporadic detections of RDX. She noted the long-term monitoring plan required that initially samples be analyzed for a much large suite of contaminants, including dioxins and furans. She explained that if a statistical evaluation shows that after four consecutive monitoring events, an analyte is below the level of concern it can be dropped from monitoring in a particular well. She said another evaluation is to run a statistical evaluation of the concentration levels to see if that particular analyte in a particular well is consistent with historical levels. She said the outcome of the evaluations determine the amount of sampling that is performed. She further explained that if the concentrations are going up and exceed what is known as a trigger level, typically set at about 10 times the level of concern, then additional sampling would be performed. Ms. Szegedi said the need for additional sampling has not been triggered. She stated if all the analytes in a well drop out, then that well can be decommissioned and so far three wells have been decommission. Ms. Szegedi said the majority of the analytes have dropped out of the sampling based on consistent non-detect levels with four metals (arsenic, lead, nickel and thallium) and one volatile organic compound, vinyl chloride, still being analyzed for from the samples. Ms. Szegedi noted the most current report recommended that nickel be dropped. She stated the only two analytes identified in the Record of Decision were arsenic and lead. She explained monitoring for the entire suite of analytes was done because of the location along the southern boundary. Ms. Szegedi said the long-term monitoring is functioning as anticipated, and at this point almost all of the wells are only being analyzed on an annual basis because the levels have decreased, with three or four wells being sampled on a semi-annual basis.

Mr. Hiler asked if decommissioned wells are sealed and permanently closed. Ms. Szegedi responded that the decommissioned wells are grouted and closed. She clarified that none of the southern boundary wells can be decommissioned, only wells within Area C. Mr. Hiler stated he thinks the southern boundary wells are important, and he is glad to see they are being monitored and being kept open. Ms. Michelin asked how often the southern boundary wells are sampled. Ms. Szegedi said most are sampled annually now; all the wells were initially monitored on a semi-annual basis. Mr. Gabel added there is no real plume in the southern boundary area, except Area B which has a separate monitoring program.

Slide 5: Ms. Szegedi advised there was a slight exceedance of lead historically in two wells on the southern boundary, and NJDEP requested additional investigation to determine if the lead is migrating off-site. She explained an analysis was done to look at whether the lead is dissolving and thus moving with the water or attaching to particulates in the water and thus not mobile. She stated an analysis with the last sampling event showed there is not mobile lead in the groundwater.

Slide 6: Ms. Szegedi presented a schedule of future work planned for the site..

Installation Restoration Program and Military Munitions Response Program /Updates

Slide 8 (of Mr. Gabel's Presentation): Mr. Gabel stated he would be giving a brief overview of the Installation Restoration Program projects.

Slide 9: Mr. Gabel stated most of the remedial investigations are complete under the Installation Restoration Program. He advised the Lake Picatinny sampling has been completed, and while the results show no ecological damage, the Army is going to consider excavating some sediment from the Lake based on hot spot definition so there could be a removal action in the future. Mr. Gabel noted the Marsh Site Investigation Report has been provided to the regulators. Mr. Gabel stated the Marsh Site is on the other side of Green Pond Brook. Mr. Gabel said the investigation indicates no further action needs to be taken at the Marsh Site, although additional sampling on the bank may be required.

Slide 10: Mr. Gabel discussed Feasibility Studies and noted the 600 Hill Groundwater feasibility study is considered approved and is going to be combined with the feasibility study for the MMRP site. He noted the Lakes Feasibility Study is going to be revised again and will include three alternatives: no further action, no further action with monitoring, and excavation. Mr. Gabel said the 45 Sites and the Non-Lakes Sites Feasibility Studies, a total of about 50 sites, propose no further action. He said the Army is discussing the Feasibility Studies with EPA and anticipates submitting revised documents no later than July. Mr. Gabel said the next steps of Proposed Plan and Record of Decision will be addressed through the new contract. Mr. Gabel said the 5 Site Feasibility Study will be re-submitted in February and future documents will be done under the new contract..

Slide 11: Mr. Gabel displayed a list of upcoming Proposed Plans and noted the 26 Site No Further Action Proposed Plan is still in draft stage, but the Army is working towards a public comment period in May.

Slides 12 and 13: Mr. Gabel discussed the status of Records of Decision. He advised the 25 Site Record of Decision was signed by Picatinny's Commander. He stated EPA is still reviewing NJDEP concerns as expressed in a letter to EPA Headquarters but hopes to be able to sign within a month. Mr. Gabel displayed a map of the location of sites with signed Records of Decision.

Slide 14: Mr. Gabel reviewed remedial action reports and long-term monitoring reports and noted a number of reports will be submitted to the regulators in the next two months. Mr. Gabel said Doodle polls will be sent out to the community members to get input on whether they would like the TAPP contractor to review each report.

Slide 15: Mr. Gabel advised the Army is working on the 2014 Installation Action Plan; the 2013 plan has been available on the Picatinny web site. He stated the Defense State Memorandum of Agreement (the vehicle through which the state gets paid for oversight at DoD facilities) was approved about six weeks ago. Mr. Gabel reiterated that Picatinny is working on a new contract to replace the expiring performance-based contract which ends in December 2014. In response to a question from Ms. Michelin, Ms. Nancy Flaherty of the Army Corps of Engineers stated the new contract will have a five year period of performance.

Next Meeting

The Board agreed to a timeframe of April for the next meeting.

A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 7:59 p.m.

Picatinny Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
February 6, 2014
Pending/In Progress Action Items

Date Created	Action Item	Person Responsible	Status
10/20/2011	Discuss available documents for review by TAPP consultant at each Board meeting	Ted Gabel	Ongoing
2/6/2014	Update the chart included in the ARCADIS presentation and send out to Board	Ted Gabel	Pending
2/6/2014	Schedule next RAB meeting for April	Ted Gabel/Katrina Harris	Pending